DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 478 749 SO 035 064

AUTHOR Mayer, Robert H.

TITLE Learning To Think Historically: The Impact of a Philosophy and Methods of History Course on Three Preservice Teachers.

PUB DATE 2003-04-00

NOTE 47p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (84th, Chicago, IL, April 21-25, 2003).

PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Beliefs; Course Evaluation; Course Objectives; *History; Interviews; *Methods Courses; Naturalistic Observation; Participant Observation; *Preservice Teachers; Qualitative Research; Social Studies; Teacher Education; *Thinking Skills

IDENTIFIERS *Historical Methods; Thematic Analysis

ABSTRACT

If students are to think historically, then teachers must think historically. One place where future history teachers might gain such cognitive practice is in history courses designed to focus on the ideas and methods of historians. A study focused on teaching future history teachers how to think about history. A course, "Philosophy and Methods of Historical Inquiry," (taught by a historian) was chosen as the site for examining the problem. The study examined the impact of the course on the historical thinking of three preservice teachers enrolled in the course and their view of how they will teach history in their future classrooms. A naturalistic methodology captured descriptions regarding student beliefs as they evolved during the semester and the relationship of those beliefs with the classroom experience. Data were gathered through interviews, participant observation of the class, and document analysis. Four themes evolved from the interviews and reflected commonalities across the talk of the preservice teachers. The themes capture the three teachers' thoughts about history before the course and changes in their thinking that took place during the course. By psychologizing historical writing, the three teachers were able to reconstruct their view of teaching. Findings reinforce the need for strong links among education departments and departments engaged in conveying the discipline. Attached are teacher interviews. (Contains 23 references.) (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 478 749

LEARNING TO THINK HISTORICALLY: THE IMPACT OF A PHILOSOPHY AND METHODS OF HISTORY COURSE ON THREE PRESERVICE TEACHERS

Robert H. Mayer
Education Department
Moravian College
Bethlehem, PA 18018

merhm02@moravian.edu

SO 035 064

Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association
April 25, 2003
Chicago, Illinois

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. H. Mayer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent

1
Introduction

The study of history is imbued with a richness and complexity that is difficult to master and is, apparently, easy to ignore. In considering the power within history, one need only contemplate the writing of a Francis Parkman or the art of a Ken Burns. The complexity can be glimpsed in the myriad issues historical work calls forth, from concerns over how the story of dropping the atomic bomb is told to the legitimacy of historians appearing as characters in the histories they write. Despite the magnitude of the discipline, or perhaps because of it, all too often history is made out to be the dull task of gathering a collection of inert information chunks. Consider the typical high school history text or the history lecture given within the context of a class driven by the need to cover a content. Thankfully, these are not the only images of the history classroom. Barton and Levstik's (1997) *Doing History* is a book crammed with snapshots of teachers opening up the wonder of history to elementary and middle school youngsters. Each picture is an example of an instance where a teacher works the miracle of bringing the essence of history into the classroom. The experiences of the children in these classrooms and others are the main target of current efforts to revitalize the teaching of history. The issues in this study are rooted in those efforts to reform the way history is being taught by opening up the teaching to the complexity and richness in the historian's world.

What marks the start of this push to improve history teaching? The question itself is a reminder of the personal and uncertain construction of history in contrast to seemingly absolute markers such as Progressive Era, Reconstruction, Renaissance. For those who started teaching in the early 1970s, the "Fenton" text (Bartlett, Fenton, Fowler and Mandelbaum, 1969) and the inquiry approach could register the beginning. If the wave began with Fenton, the movement picked up momentum across the Atlantic in England with the push for historical thinking within the National History Curriculum (Booth, 1994) and returned to this side of the ocean with a burst of research on the topic (Carrtero & Voss, 1994; Leinhardt, Beck, & Stainton, 1994; Wineburg, 2001)

that continues today. Calls for reform in history teaching, including the Bradley Commission (1989) and the National History Standards (1996), have served to sustain and help define this push. The mixed results of this movement clearly cannot be blamed on lack of effort or concern. To understand the glacial nature of reform, one must return to the discipline of history itself.

Wineburg (1999) labels historical thinking an "unnatural act," a reminder that history will not readily reveal its majesty. In a series of studies, Wineburg (1994,1991) delineates the manner in which historians think about history, displaying it as a complicated process not done readily by others. The high school students in Wineburg's 1991 study read historical writing primarily for comprehension. Historians who examined the same materials, including primary documents, a history textbook, and historical fiction, read across the documents. They began by sourcing a piece, continued by contextualizing it, and then corroborated claims across the documents. Historians read for subtext by carefully considering the author of a document and the author's audience. In another study, the holistic description (1998) of one historian "weaving the context" for a series of documents in order to make sense of Lincoln's racial views serves to illustrate the complexities inherent in the task of teaching anyone to think historically. Wineburg's studies illustrate the nuanced and sophisticated thinking required to read historical text and think historically.

Given the complexity of history conveyed in Wineburg's study, is it possible to teach young people how to think historically? Current research concerned with the teaching and learning of history suggest this possibility. For instance, high school students in Yeager and Doppen's (2001) study were able to develop richer understandings of history through the analysis of multiple sources, including primary documents. Through a more thorough grasp of the historical context, many students in the study came to see multiple explanations for President Truman's use of the atomic bomb. The students were able to view the events from the perspectives of different participants. This new mental frame allowed students in this study to gain empathy for

the people who were part of this historical moment. In a second example, fourth and fifth graders in Barton's (1997) research came to understand basic ideas about the use of evidence in history, including how to establish the reliability of one document from a particular event over another. Some also understood the need for corroboration in reconciling conflicting versions of the same event. Despite these cognitive gains, the students had difficulty applying these new ways of thinking in their construction of an account of the Lexington Battle. These studies and others suggest that young people can learn to think in ways that would reflect the historian's work.

Emerging from the research is an image of history teaching that reveals the complicated nature of historical thinking as mirrored in the teaching act itself. Bain's (2000) description of an attempt to remodel his high school classroom to teach the sort of thinking reflected in the research illustrates this parallel complexity between the act of thinking historically and the act of teaching young people to think historically. For instance, students are encouraged to distinguish between history-as-event and history-as-account by writing a description of their first day of school and comparing their telling with that of others. They also focus on one common event, such as a baseball game, and examine multiple accounts of the game with the actual occurrence. Bain wants to elevate history learning beyond the traditional driven model. As he states, "The entire first unit challenges students' fact-based suppositions of history by creating epistemological problems out of their own experiences" (p. 338). By the end of the year, Bain does sense some change in his students, but experiences the most profound changes within his own thinking. Bain's experience suggests that that history teachers need to change the way they think in order encourage their students to think differently about history.

The issues examined in Bain's article lead directly to the broad question that lies at the heart of this study. If young people are to think historically, then their teachers must think historically. How can teachers learn how to think historically? One place where future history teachers might gain such cognitive complexity is in history courses

designed to focus specifically on the ideas and methods of historians. McDiarmid (1994) argues that helping new teachers learn how to think historically and then translate those understandings to pedagogy is no easy task. McDiarmid and Vinten-Johansen (2000) explain how the experience of learning to think historically and the experience of teaching historical thinking are typically taught in separate contexts, one in the history department and the the other in the education department. Further, as suggested by campus to classroom research (Yeager and Davis, 1995; Yeager and Wilson, 1997), it is often difficult for preservice teachers to take their understandings of history and employ them in real classroom settings. The value of having future history teachers think more like historians and then learn how to bring that thinking into practice suggests an important area of research.

The focus of this study is the first part of the thinking/practice equation; that is teaching future history teachers how to think about history. The research explores one potential arena for new teachers to enrich their understanding of history, a unique history course entitled The Philosophy and Methods of Historical Inquiry The unusual nature of the Historical Inquiry course makes this an ideal site for further examining the problem of how to help future teachers learn to think historically. The course is especially ideal because the historian teaching the course also supervises social studies student teachers. Though instruction is not designed specifically for preservice teachers, the professor teaches with an understanding of what the secondary history classroom is like. The study looks to examine the impact of the course on the historical thinking of three preservice teachers and their view of how they will teach history in their future classrooms. The following questions guided the research:

- What understandings about, experiences with, and beliefs about how to teach history do the teachers bring to the course?
- In what ways does the course affect the way the teachers think about and plan to teach history?
- What are the salient aspects of the course that have an impact on the ways

teachers think about history and history teaching?

Research Procedures

Subjects

The three participants in the study were preservice teachers enrolled in the fall, 2001 section of the "Historical Inquiry" course, History 328 (HI 328). The main criteria for selection were the subjects be enrolled in the course during the fall of 2001 and be planning to student teach within a year and a half of the course's completion. They also needed to demonstrate solid academic performance as reflected in a GPA of 3.0 or higher. With an enrollment of ten students that semester, only three students met all three criteria. All three of the preservice teachers, Tamara, Terri, and Edith[1], were female, white, and traditional undergraduates having entered college directly from high school. They had taken 4, 5, and 6 history courses respectively prior to the "Historical Inquiry" course and were taking no others during this semester. Tamara had completed a general methods course the previous year and was taking a course in special methods for social studies teachers concurrently with HI 328. Terri was taking a general methods course concurrently with HI 328. Edith was completing her final methods courses, reading and science, in anticipation of spring student teaching. Terri and Edith were seniors and Tamara was a junior. Terri and Tamara were studying to be secondary social studies teachers and Edith was working for certification to teach in elementary school. All three were social science majors, the traditional major for students wishing to teach social studies.

The College

The study was done in a small liberal arts college in a mid-Atlantic state. Within the college, there is a strong tradition supporting teacher education. The tradition includes tight links between the education department and other college departments.

[1] All names used are pseudonyms.

One example of this linkage takes place during student teaching. Secondary students are supervised by faculty from both the Education Department and the major departments.

The Instructor and The Course

The professor was Richard Thomas. Thomas is an active historian who at the time of the study was entering his 32nd year of teaching. As of 2002, he had taught the course twice a year for 31 years. Over the years, Thomas systematically redesigned the course to align with his personal beliefs. The redesign included his publishing a text to be used with the course.

The course, History 328, is entitled The Philosophy and Methods of Historical Inquiry. Overall, the course works to give students a background in philosophical ideas guiding developments within the field of history. This is accomplished through a close reading of classic historical writing from Biblical times to the twentieth century. The two major texts for History 328 are *What is History?* by E. H. Carr and *The Faces of Clio: An Anthology of Classics in Historical Writing from Ancient Times to the Present* written by the course instructor. Since *Clio* is the main text, a brief description of the book's format is necessary. The book consists of a preface written by the author, and 21 selections from "classic" historians starting with an excerpt from *Second Samuel* and ending with "The Next Assignment" by William L. Langer, which has a copyright of 1958. Throughout the rest of the text are pieces from Thucydides, Venerable Bede, William Bradford, Leopold von Ranke, Karl Marx, Frederick Jackson Turner, Crane Brinton, and others. Each selection includes an introduction by Thomas containing a brief biographical overview of the selection's author, a discussion of his major work, and a description of his writing style. Overall, the introduction works to place the author in the context of the philosophical flow of historical writing.

History 328 is a requirement of both history majors and social science majors,

the major created for students seeking secondary certification in social studies. Elementary teacher education candidates are required to have a major in an area of their choosing. Some do pick social science as their major. A social science major completes 7 history courses, and 6 courses in the various social sciences. A history major completes 10 history courses.

Methods

A naturalistic methodology (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) was employed in order to capture rich descriptions of both student beliefs as they evolved during the semester and the relation of those beliefs with the classroom experience. The following methods were used to gather data:

- Interviews with preservice teachers: Three intensive semistructured interviews (Seidman, 1998), one before the start of the course, one during the course, and one after completion of the course, occurred with each preservice teacher. Borrowing from Seidman, the purpose of interview one was to engender a life history of the teachers' experiences with learning history and to ascertain their precourse views on history and history teaching. (See Appendix A for interview protocol.) Interview two allowed each teacher to discuss her experience with the course as well as her evolving views on history and history teaching. The third interview repeated the same topics as interview two in order to establish teacher perspectives at the end of the course. (See Appendix B for interview protocol for both the second and third interview.)
- Interviews with course instructor: A semistructured interview with the course instructor took place before the start of the semester to ascertain the instructor's perspective on the purpose of the course. (See interview C for interview protocol.)
- Weekly nonparticipant observation of class: The class met three times a week for

50 minutes. The researcher observed one class a week. He sat in the circle with the students and the professor, took field notes on classroom conversation and activities, but did not participate in classroom events during the fifty minute sessions. Observation focused on the classroom discourse concerning history in general but zeroing in on topics of historical thinking. The involvement of the three participants was a primary concern, but such involvement was observed in the context of the general give and take of the class.

- Document analysis of course syllabus, other handouts from the course, major papers and tests: Course documents (syllabus and handouts) were obtained in order to ascertain course goals. Preservice teacher papers and tests were warehoused and analyzed in order to examine the teachers' evolving views on history.

Analysis

An inductive process was employed to analyze data from interviews, field notes, and course documents. In other words, categories for making sense of interviews, field notes, and artifacts emerged from the data and were not constructed a priori. A method of constant comparison (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Lincoln and Guba, 1985) of data sets was employed. More specifically, data was analyzed in the following manner:

All student interviews were taped and typescripts were made. Because Professor Thomas requested that his interview not be taped, the interviewer took notes during the interview session. Notes were written up immediately after the interview took place. A profile based on the analysis was constructed and sent to Thomas as a member check. Thomas expressed comfort with the accuracy of the profile.

Each typescript of each interview was read carefully and multiple times. Notes were written on the typescripts as categories emerged from the reading. Attention was paid to the language used by subjects in order to generate category names. As

categories emerged, the researcher read back and forth across data sets, determining whether there was support for categories within the data. Chunks of subject talk reflecting categories were placed on index cards. Index cards were compared to ascertain whether the separate items reflected the same categories and were distinct from other categories. Next, relationships between categories were explored. Establishing these relationships allowed interview themes to emerge. Building from themes, profiles for each student were constructed. They were sent to the students with the following questions: "Do you recognize your thinking in what I have written? Have I gotten your ideas correctly? Do I have anything wrong?" All three responded to inquiries indicating their comfort with the manner in which their views were portrayed.

Course artifacts and tests were read and re-read. Marginal notes were taken. Again, categories and themes emerged inductively from reading the documents. Documents served to triangulate findings from other sources. For instance, the course syllabus was used in relation to Thomas' interview as a second venue for examining course goals. Tests and quizzes were used as another means for seeing what ideas were emphasized in the course and students' reactions to those ideas.

Field notes were taken for each observation. Field notes were read and re-read. Themes that emerged were indicated in the margins of notes. As themes from other sources emerged, field notes were examined again as a way of testing the veracity of these themes.

Overall, the process entailed inductive analysis of data followed by an examination of categories and then an examination of emerging themes by returning to the raw data as a check.

Findings and Discussion: Development of Student Thinking and History 328

Course Goals

Professor Thomas has several clear goals, which he lays out in his syllabus and which he shared in the interview that took place before the course began. These goals include:

- "Deep Reading" of text: Students should come to read the subtext within an author's writing. Part of that subtext includes an understanding of the author's underlying view of historical causation. Through "deep reading," students are encouraged to focus on literary style that contains clues concerning the author's philosophy of history. Students are to begin reading by asking questions such as: Why did the author write this way?
- The central problem of the course is answering the question: What is history? Focusing on a selection, the student is to ask: What makes this piece history?
- Because historians don't always come right out and state their position, students must use logic to get at it.
- Questioning Spirit: In addition to asking questions of text, students should be willing to question the instructor and, by inference, other instructors. The theme here is: Take nothing for granted.
- Generating Positions: Students should learn how to make claims and support those claims with specific reference to text. In class and in writing, students are to be active in their construction of positions, or as the instructor puts it, he wants the student to "create wisdom" (I, 8/2[2] ; Course Syllabus).
- Views about History: The instructor wants students to come away from the course with certain ideas about history. These include:
    - ◇ Historical knowledge is neither certain nor clearcut.
    - ◇ Historical accounts are built from the perspectives of multiple witnesses to

[2] Indicates date of interview

an event. Each perspective is different.

- ◇ The cultures within which historians live is an important factor that directs their focus.
- ◇ There is a past and there is a historical account. The two are different.
- ◇ Ideas about history have changed over time.
- ◇ A study of philosophy of history is central to a study of history.
- ◇ History is about real events. In studying history we can capture that immediacy (8/2; Course Syllabus).

Observation of class and interviews with the students substantiate these as course goals. One aspect of these objectives reflects an idea that is central to the course. Throughout the semester, there is an intensive focus on the historian's literary style. Conversation about literary style leads to other issues, including historical methodology, epistemological stance, and the historian's views of causation. The theme of literary style will be revisited through presentation of interview and participant observation findings.

Early Experiences Learning History

In the interview prior to the course, the three preservice teachers were asked to describe their most salient experiences learning history. From their elementary school experience, the three remembered studying primarily local and/or state history. The clearest memory of the teaching approach used was of projects and fieldtrips. Beyond these methods, students remembered little. This lack of memories could be due to distance in time or it could be, as Edith stated, that "in early elementary (school) you don't really learn that much history" (I, 8/27)[3] .

Memory of middle school was firmer but not so different. All remembered primarily projects and research that they did. Edith recalled a seventh-grade teacher who encouraged student input through discussions. It was important to her because, "It

[3] Indicates number and date of teacher interview

was the first time that a teacher actually sat down and had a discussion about a modern subject" (I, 8/27). Terri's memory of middle school was the richest. She remembered activities from all three grades but in particular recalled an eighth-grade teacher who "was very excited about what he was doing" (I, 8/6). In that class, students did research in groups and played learning games. Terri also recalled a special activity the teacher did where he would lecture on a given topic and then stop and "always say 'The ball is in your court, what are you going to do?'" This activity was special to Terri because "it challenged you to think about what you would have done" (I, 8/6). Tamara had few recollections from her middle school experience.

For all three, the most salient memories of history were in high school. Edith talked about a ninth-grade world history class that was grounded in lecture. She discussed this class with little excitement. Her enthusiasm was saved for an eleventh-grade interdisciplinary course taught by her English and social studies teacher. In that class, she wrote a novella about the civil war. She claimed that was a powerful learning experience for history because "we had to do a lot of research on the Civil War" (I, 8/27). For Terri, her most satisfying history learning took place through her study of Latin. From that study, she developed an immediate sense of Ancient Rome. Tamara was bored by her world history class in ninth grade but resonated to American history and her eleventh-grade teacher. In that class, students played the stock market game, saw movies, and did an oral history. For her..."the eleventh grade was real history for me and that's when I took history and really got to love it because the teacher really went into detail about it and made it fun" (I, 8/1).

In terms of experiences learning history outside of school, Terri presented the most interesting encounters. Doing history was part of her family experience. Her mother had kept family trees and was able to trace the family back several generations. She also knew the generations going back on her father's side. She is unusual in that most of her relatives live in the same county. Family reunions allowed her to fill in any gaps. Edith identified travel (Williamsburg, Gettysburg, Ireland) as a main way she

learned history outside of school. Also, she lives in a city where people have a historical consciousness. This allows her to observe history in the buildings around her. Finally, she learned about history from books and movies. Tamara mentioned television and movies as sources for learning about history. She also mentioned storytelling from older relatives as a personal source of learning.

Interview Themes

The four themes coming from the interviews presented below reflect commonalities across the talk of Edith, Tamara, and Terri. Within those common issues there are important differences for each as well. The themes capture the thinking about history that the three brought to the course and the changes in thinking that took place during the time they were taking the course. Beyond thinking about history, the three developed new ideas about how history should be taught. The tight connection between new ideas about history and history teaching suggest that the course had an important impact. This likelihood of this impact is reinforced through some discussion of events from the course by the interviewees.

Theme 1

Core ideas serve to both unify each student's thinking about history and to guide the evolution of that thinking throughout the course.

The following are summaries of remarks that reflect the first theme made by each during the first interview. Recall that this first interview took place before the course began.

Edith

For Edith, the present is grounded in the past. More specifically, while considering a current event, one can also see the events which led up to that current one. This brings Edith to the conclusion that people today are affected by what happened in previous times. As she states:

> If you think historically and if you're asked to discuss something, you're

> going to think about the past also, not just what you see in front of you now; you actually take what's beyond that. If you were to ask a question about how a system works in a country or how the country is set up, say Germany, you wouldn't say, "Oh well, there's Germany." But you could say, "Well there was the Berlin Wall" and you would think about the conflict that's in the country itself, not just just what it is now. You could also think about the past and could think about changes (I, 8/27).

Tamara

Tamara focuses on the "personal" in history as an important idea to explore. She considers it in a variety of ways. First of all, there is the personal within oral history as a means for getting at historical events. In describing an oral history she did in high school, Tamara states:

> Because the stuff my great-uncle told me was not information you could read about in a history book, maybe in a memoir or something like that. It was more of a personal account or a first-hand account of what it was actually like to be in something you couldn't read in a textbook... (I, 8/1).

The personal is also reflected in the historical interpretation carried out by students of history. Her concern here is with how students of history make sense of historical events for themselves. This is Tamara's response to the question: "what does it mean to think historically?"

> I think what it means is to look at the facts. This will happen here, here, and here and just to make up your own conclusion about how you think about that time period. Maybe if it was good or it was bad. How would you have changed it, or what caused it? What effects it might have had (I, 8/1).

Note that Tamara does not use the word personal here. It seems that Tamara is making a claim about the right or duty of history students to make personal judgments about "the facts."

Earlier, in a discussion about historical telling in movies, Tamara does connect the word personal to the act of historical interpretation. Some movies are worthy as historical presentation and others are not:

> because the director might take his or her own personal view and then form the movie that way. They may not tell what really happened but to make a story out of it instead of this is what really happened (I, 8/1).

There is then a positive and a negative sense to Tamara's use of the word personal. The personal in oral history and in the historical interpretation done by history students are both legitimate aspects of doing history. The personal can go too far as with film directors who don't convey "what really happened" and instead "tell a story." There is a tension in Tamara's talk about this notion of the personal, which will be discussed under theme 3. For now, it is important to be aware of the notion of "personal" as an idea that is central to Tamara's thinking about history.

Terri

Terri enters the course with two core ideas that affect the development of her thinking during the semester. First of all for Terri, history is an attempt to recover "real things that happened" (I, 8/6) from the historical past. A historian does this by placing a text within its context. In considering the Bible as a primary historical document, she talks about the figure of Paul. In order to fully grasp the Bible as historical text, a historian must:

> see what was going on in that time and why Paul wrote to them and what they were going through. The turmoil that was going on there and you could see what Paul was dealing with. It tells you about a little town and what that town was doing at that time (I, 8/6).

In her first interview, Terri posits a second key idea. For a given event or set of events, there are multiple broad frames one can employ to view the past. Terri gets at this idea by discussing one semester where she studied Roman history in different classes.

> I was seeing it from the Roman point of view and then I was seeing it from the religious point of view where the Romans were wrong and they were coming in and destroying everybody. And then I would see it from a historical point of view in the Ancient Rome class by just learning it on a neutral basis. In Latin, I was learning about it from the Roman point of view; in religion from the ancient history (I, 8/6).

First of all, Terri posits the possibility of multiple frames for viewing history and considers the historical perspective as neutral. Also, she does not connect the two core

ideas, history as recovery of the real and the importance of multiple frames, in the context of the first interview. It will be interesting to see how that belief in historical neutrality and other ideas is affected by the experience of HI 328.

Theme 2

Through the linking of ideas presented in the course to previous beliefs, each student develops a unique way of thinking about history.

Within History 328, a clear position about history is presented and reinforced through multiple examples. Though the three students focused on the same set of ideas and reflected on the same experiences from the class, each came away with a unique way of thinking. This seems to be a function of each students' consideration of Thomas' perspective in relation to the perspectives they brought into the course.

Edith

One of the major themes of the course is the concept of causation. Thomas states this in his interview. Through a "deep reading" of the text, he hopes that students come to understand the author's underlying view of historical causation. Thomas reinforces the importance of causation through a generic study guide to be used with all readings from *Clio*. As students read, they are to draw out the historian's view of causation. This concept is further emphasized through quizzes, tests, and papers where students are called upon to present a particular historian's position on causation.

Causation was an idea that made sense to Edith. She connected this notion logically to her core belief in the present as connected to the past. For Edith, the historian's task is to uncover the causal chain of events that leads to the present. She will want her students to do this uncovering when they study history in her class.

> To actually think about what you are learning, not only in terms of as a story, but to think about why it happened and about how it affected people. Think about it in relation to other aspects. Think about it more with an idea of what's happening. Not to just know the facts but to also know background information. Know why it is happening. Know how it affected different things that happened also (II, 10/12).

In explaining why young people need to study history, she explains: "If they need to know what's going on now, then they need to know what happened before to understand how they got to this point" (II, 10/12). In addition to developing a view of history, Edith is also coming to a view of how she will teach history.

Tamara

Thomas uses the term "deep reading" to identify an important course goal. Through "deep reading," he looks for students to read the subtext of historical writing in order to to get at the author's position. Tamara's encounter with "deep reading" of the text allowed her to develop a richer sense of the personal in doing history. Through her reading of *Clio*, Tamara considered how the historian's unique position was contained in the writing. These thoughts come through in her final two interviews.

For Tamara, the student of history works to "just analyze the text and not to take it for face value and just to look at it from the author's point of view" (III, 12/13). The reader does this in order to get at "what the author is trying to really say instead of just what is stated there" (III, 12/13). This is because the historian always "brings his own bias into writing history" (III, 12/13). Tamara describes the process one should employ to move beyond the "face value" of words. "You could look at it maybe for what the author is trying to say but in not so many words. Like little subtle hints that he might be giving, maybe even with the punctuation or the type of word he tries to use"(III, 12/13). The student of history reads with great scrutiny to draw out the historian's personal slant.

Tamara came into the course with a focus on the personal in history. Thomas gave her a method for extracting the personal from historical writing. This allows her to acknowledge the historian's bias as part of the personal which must be considered in historical analysis. Through her encounter with Thomas' "deep reading," Tamara's thinking continues to evolve.

Terri

Through an exploration of historical methodology in History 328, Terri discovers

a means for recovering the "real" in historical events. Though not the prime focus of the course, historical method was considered throughout and then emphasized toward the end. For instance, in an early discussion of the historian Francesco Guicciardini, the class discussed the sources he used to construct his account (Classnotes 9/26). Towards the end of the semester, students examined a letter written by Franklin Roosevelt as a college student. In examining the letter, they did not know who wrote the letter and had to use clues from the writing to identify the author (Classnotes, 12/4). Through such classes, Terri encountered methods which allowed her to better understand how historians recover "real" events from the remains of earlier times.

In the final two interviews, Terri identifies several ways that a historian can enhance what she calls "the quality of their information" (II, 10/3) in order to establish what "most likely happened" (III, 12/19). A historian should try to employ multiple sources including people who represent different views. The sources must be "secure" and the historian can't be making "false quotations" (II, 10/3). In addition, a source that was "there and saw it" is "more truthful than if you weren't there" (III, 12/19). The better source is both "there" and is able to "tell it from a neutral point of view." (II, 10/3) In other words, the best source is one who can maintain a distance from the event. Basically, "If you take multiple perspectives, it's a more solid case that that actually happened" (III, 12/19). Thomas gives Terri a method for recovering the "real" in history.

Theme 3

Unresolved issues, questions, or contradictions in positions push thinking about history forward. These issues generally relate to epistemological aspects of historical thinking.

Though Edith, Tamara, and Terri are most likely not familiar with the word epistemology, the issues with which they struggle are fueled by epistemological questions. Is there such a thing as neutral telling in history? What role does the personal play in constructing historical accounts? To what extent can historians be certain when

they make knowledge claims? Such "confusions" are not stumbling blocks to inquiry. Rather, they push these three students to consider issues that are mirrored in the debates of the historians they read in *Clio*.

Edith

Edith is drawn through History 328 uncertain about the epistemic claims made by historians. In her first interview, Edith presents an unfinished epistemological position. She is clear that historians write from a perspective. "...there are a lot of accounts that are written from one side or the other" (I, 8/27). The interesting thing about Edith's quote is that it leaves open the possibility that there are some accounts not written from a perspective. Is she suggesting there are neutral versions of a historical event? The course will force her to think about this issue directly.

In her second interview, Edith considers whether there can be completely objective historical writing. Initially, she thinks you can "stay in the middle" but it would be "boring" (II, 10/12). Later, she reflects and decides that one cannot write an objective history.

> I: Is it possible to write an objective history?
>
> E: I guess, yes it is...No. I don't think it is actually because even if you take out your own personal views of what's going on, you'll still have where you are. If you're writing about history and it's about your own country then you are going to have the view of someone who is actually in the country (II, 10/12).

Here Edith abandons the possibility that history can be written from a neutral perspective. How does the course help to move her to this position? Close reading of the text, as discussed in theme two, is a likely factor. As with Tamara and Terri, Edith explores the historian's background carefully and comes to see the positional nature of historical writing. This exploration helps her to answer the question she seems to be asking about objectivity.

Where earlier Edith considered the possibility that history could be written from a neutral perspective she now proclaims: "There's no right or wrong" (III, 12/10). How

does she get there? First of all, historical writing is positional. Historical writing is grounded by the "historian's background and why they wrote what they wrote" (III, 12/10). She goes on: "You have to think about the historian's point of view" (III, 12/10). Edith uses the American Revolution as an example to discuss the positional nature of history. An American writer would tell this event differently from a British writer.

> If you pick up an elementary/middle school history book and you read about the American Revolution, you're going to probably get a different view than you would in a British textbook because of where the historian went for his facts and what he was looking for. An American historian wouldn't get into like saying they were bad. "Those Americans, they were bad..." I think if you go to a British textbook it would show less happiness with the American revolution (III,12/10).

The tension in Edith's thinking propels her forward. If in history there is no right or wrong, does that mean all historical tellings are equal? How does one weigh the perspectival telling of one historian against another? A resolution could come through a consideration of historical method. By the end of the course, Edith does comes to better understand the methodology employed by historians. In discussing one historian's work she states: "between the two sets of documents, if they coincide then that probably is the truth" (III, 12/10). Corroboration of evidence could make one historian's position more "right" than another's. At this point, it is not clear how Edith reconciles the historian's capacity for moving toward the truth and her discussion of the opposing interpretations of the American Revolution. Given that her position evolved in HI 328, it will most likely continue to change with other similar experiences.

Tamara

Remember that Tamara came to the course with ideas about the personal. In considering movies as a device for conveying history, she contrasted *Schindler's List* as a "really accurate account of the war and of the holocaust" (I, 8/1) with a director who "might take his or her own personal view and then form the movie that way" (I, 8/1). She does not seem to consider the positional nature of Steven Spielberg as a teller of the

events. This reflects an epistemological issue that is directly confronted in the course. Thomas asks the students to explore the perspective of the various historians they read and to consider how those perspectives affect the writing. As Tamara describes:

> We were forced by the questions he asked like what does the author think the purpose for writing a history of this account (is). You are kind of forced to read between the lines and sort of find out what exactly the author was trying to say when he wrote (III, 12/13).

As a result of such conversation, Tamara confronts the personal nature of all historical writing. By the end of the course, she identifies her task as a student of history to "just analyze text and not to take it for face value and just look at it from the author's point of view" (III, 12/13). Earlier in the interview, Tamara presents this point of view in more depth:

> If you read something, you are always going to wonder what made him say that or what would make him say one thing or another. If you know the story, what would make him leave something out if he didn't think it was important?(III, 12/13).

Though she acknowledges the personal bias of the historian, she also states that a historian does one of two things. He is either "trying to be truthful" or "putting forth his own opinion" (III, 12/13). Whichever, she does conclude that history "could be wrong." Historians who are "trying to be truthful" have methods they can use to enhance accuracy by generating evidence-backed assertions. Historians can "compare different accounts and see which ones are consistent in the text" (III, 12/13). In addition, a historian could find "artifacts" and other "real evidence" (III, 12/13). In doing this, the historian tries to "make it as accurate as possible." Tamara suggests then is a method for determining who works toward truthfulness and who is merely positing an opinion without support. Were she to go back to a discussion of movies, would she be inclined to maintain her view that there are some filmmakers only interested in presenting a "personal view"(III, 12/13)? She might be more inclined to acknowledge that despite its "accuracy," *Schindler's List* presents the position of its filmmaker.

Through all of her epistemological questioning, Tamara comes away from the course with a certainty that within the historian's work there is uncertainty. After reviewing summaries of the three interviews, Tamara commented: "I think the main point I am trying to make is that one can never be 100 per cent certain they know all the accurate facts in history" (e-mail 2/24/03). Tamara's reflections about historical epistemology lead her to one of Thomas' course goals, an understanding that historical knowledge is tenuous

Terri

Terri's view that her history course captures the Roman period from a neutral point of view is quickly challenged by History 328. She comes to see that students of history must examine the historian's point of view. A historian's writing comes from a particular time and is written for a particular audience. In addition, historians write for a purpose. All of this affects the historical writing, starting with the choice of topic. "We look at the author's reason for writing it and maybe stuff that happened in his/her life that made him write this way or write about this...It's not necessarily just the content of what we're talking about" (II, 10/3).

As with Tamara, Terri describes opposing purpose in different historical writing: "When you're reading, you can tell if the author is concerned about presenting you with the truth or just telling a nice little story to entertain" (II,10/3). This pushes her to consider historical methodology as discussed under theme 2. Like Tamara, Terri comes to see that the historian's account can both have a bias and a truthfulness. This gives Terri a rich sense of how history is constructed.

Theme 4

Ideas about history become ideas about history teaching, but slowly.

Though History 328 was not a course in methodology, all three of the students changed their views about how they would teach history by the end of the course.

Tamara, Terri, and Edith came into the course with an interest in activity as a primary methodology. This view shifts by the end of the course. Change in teaching philosophy seems to be a function of the change in how each viewed history. Though all three were taking courses on methodology at the time, HI 328 seems to be the most important factor promoting these changes. The methods course taken by Tamara was general and did not address issues of history. Similarly, Edith's courses focused on methods related to teaching reading and science. The special methods course taken by Terri used the social studies as an organizing frame and discussed teaching methods such as cooperative learning, which are generic to all social studies content. Since this course impact was most telling with Tamara and Terri, the discussion will start with them.

Tamara

Before the course began, Tamara's views on teaching history reflected her own experience as a student in the classroom. She stated that she would start with "a basic outline of all the events we have to learn" including instruction with "homework and worksheets" and then she would move into "fun activities" (I, 8/6) including book reports, dioramas, movies, games, and Internet activities. Some of the instruction would be experiential through bringing people into the classroom or through fieldtrips. At this point in her talk about history teaching, there seems to be a divide. There are the facts and there is the fun. This position mirrored Tamara's memory of learning history in public schools as lecture ("boring") and activities ("fun").

Shifts in Tamara's beliefs about history are reflected in her shifting views on teaching history. Here is what she says in her second interview about how she will teach the subject:

> I would like to have my students think on their own and form their own opinions, but I would also ask them leading questions. Maybe this could help to direct them to a certain text. It might help them in backing up their opinion if they have an opinion but they have no clue. I could ask them questions or lead them to a part of the book where maybe, that's where their thinking comes in. I could give them differing opinions and maybe they could debate me on why their opinion is right and my opinion is wrong (II, 10/10).

In teaching history, the facts are no longer isolated from the personal parts of history. Facts and opinions are intertwined. Students will explore competing opinions on a given topic and ultimately, she will have students form their own opinions. They will be encouraged to back up their opinions with facts from the text. Tamara's main job will be asking "leading questions."

Later, Tamara describes how she will bring the methodology of the historian that she encountered in HI 328 into her classroom. This is what she said in her final interview, which took place after the course:

> Well, I think first I'll have to teach the facts like what the textbook says, what does the textbook have to say? Just so they will have a background knowledge of history or the event that we are talking about for the specific chapter. What I would like to do is bring in documents such as letters or maybe even part of a diary taken from that timeframe. Maybe we could compare them and contrast them to see what the one says compared to the other. I really would like to do that in my class. I definitely want to make it fun and interesting for them because I find it so interesting already. But I know a lot of kids don't and I really want to make it interesting and fun for them. Maybe see a play about a certain event or some little activities to get them interested and to get them motivated to learn (III, 12/13).

She continues to identify the need for factual knowledge as an element in history instruction, but now it is incorporated into a broader scheme. Students will use the facts to better understand their work with primary documents. And finally, Tamara continues to see the need to have activities which make the class "interesting and fun." Beyond motivation, it is not clear how Tamara sees such activities fitting into her overall vision.

Tamara's thinking about how to teach history moves from a facts/fun approach reflective of her earlier experiences learning history toward a strategy that encompasses ideas about the discipline of history itself, which she came to as a student in Thomas' class. Building from her own focus on the personal in history, Tamara wants her students to form their own opinions and learn how to back them up. Mirroring Dr. Thomas, she wants to use questions to help students develop and examine their

positions and she wants students to encounter primary documents as she did with Thomas. Finally, Tamara's call for fun activities remains a nonintegrated piece of her philosophy. In mentioning such activities, she is clearly thinking about the students who will inhabit her classroom. Perhaps this focus reflects a concern that her future students experience the best from Tamara's own earlier experiences and avoid the worst. It is interesting to consider how Tamara's encounter with students in her own history class will allow her to bring the pieces of this vision together.

Terri

In her first interview, Terri identifies projects and fieldtrips as the best way to teach history. "I think hands-on learning is so much more an attention grabber for kids" (I, 8/6). These approaches involve the students. She acknowledges that there is also a time when you have to "sit down and just listen and also read material" (I, 8/6). In addition, she mentions the use of primary documents as a preferred strategy because then you get history "directly from the people who lived that life" (I, 8/6). This last method seems to connect with her view that history involves the recovery of real events.

As the course goes on, Terri's view of experiential learning grows as she considers what it means to focus on the "real" in history. Not surprisingly, Terri argues that history should be taught in a manner that makes it "real" for her students. Her strategy for accomplishing this includes having students do their own family trees and using primary documents. Beyond that, she will want her students to engage in an analysis of primary documents in a manner that reflects the experiences she had in 328. In her final interview, Terri presents this concrete example:

> One thing that came to mind about the way I teach history is I'd definitely use more primary documents than I probably would have before. Cause I think they are a big part of what you are learning rather than just reading a textbook. Like even when I did my lessons in pre-student teaching, I did lessons on Robin Hood. I had found a picture of what's believed to be Robin Hood's tombstone and it was in old English. I put it on an overhead and had the kids try and figure out what it was saying and stuff. They really liked it. Like it was hard and they

> were making outrageous guesses, but they really enjoyed it. I just think it's something different and the kids can actually look at a piece and I think it makes it more real to see that it was actually from that time rather than just reading a textbook because you are looking at the actual history rather than just reading what somebody wrote down about it (III, 12/19).

For Terri, kids will uncover the "real" in history from encounters with the actual artifacts from an earlier time.

The encounter must also include an appreciation of the poisitionality of such artifacts:

> Kids need to understand why this is being written, who wrote it, what was going on in their life, what was going on at the time. You have to provide kids with all that information in order for them to be able to get anything out of it (II, 10/3).

It is interesting to note that in establishing the reality of earlier times, Terri looks to have students understand the positional nature of historical writing as she had experienced it in Thomas' course.

In her final interview, Terri describes history as an active process. Here are some phrases Terri uses for talking about how one studies history: "putting it together for yourself" (III, 12/19); "figuring it out for yourself and make up your own opinions (III, 12/19); "put together the stuff...to form my own view" (III, 12/19); "piecing it together"(III, 12/19); "put together those different ideas" (III, 12/19); "form your own picture" and "picture it yourself" (III,12/19). These phrases confound the work of the historian with the work of a student of history. Both must be active. In that spirit, Terri calls for a lively history classroom. She endorses the use of projects. Further, she argues that history is boring when you just read. Using primary documents makes it "more real." These are what you use to "figure out" history. This is best exemplified in her Robin Hood lesson. Her thinking continues to revolve around the goal of having students experience the "reality" or immediacy of earlier times. She weds that to the notion that accomplishing such a recovery is a function of being active. In describing the Robin Hood lesson, Terri does not discuss methods she explored in History 328

presented earlier. This seems to be an element from the course that is missing from her classroom vision. Perhaps she will be able to consider the use of specific methodology for making history more real when she creates lessons for her own classroom.

Edith

Edith starts off the course identifying the following as methods she hopes to employ in her classroom: fieldtrips, projects, literature (historical fiction), movies, video, "actual pictures," and people coming in to discuss their experiences. This statement captures her rationale for such methods:

> If you were to read it in a book it's not totally real to you. You could imagine what they are saying by looking at the pictures. The same thing with television. You could see it but it's not right there in front of you (I, 8/27).

Edith's position shifts to reflect her experience in the course and her thinking. In her future classes students will:

> ...be having discussions with one another, not just talking about just a list of what happened, but actually talking about the events in more of an engaged way I guess. Not just saying well this happened and then that happened. Now you're saying this happened, it kind of caused this to happen and this person did this because of this. It's actually tying things together more. (II, 10/12).

Edith's class will be driven by discussion, which helps students recover the causal chain of events in history. Her preferred method mimics the approach in History 328 and reflects her view that the present is grounded in the past.

In her final interview, Edith comes back to the importance of making history "fun and interesting." Here, she draws on a field experience in a first-grade classroom where she senses "what they care about in history is minor" (III, 12/10). She looks to employ historical fiction and "activities where the kids get involved with history" (III, 12/10). At the same time, she looks to "encourage my students to ... think about what they are learning. Think about why a historian wrote this, why is it important. Not just teach them what it is but have them think about it" (III, 12/10).

Edith's involvement with a field experience at the time of the course seems to

have an impact on her thinking. She looks to engage her students through activity. At the same time, as she herself encountered in Thomas' class, she will push her students to think in particular ways about history. At the time of the third interview, these two elements, activity and thinking, stand fragmented within her philosophical view. Perhaps this reflects the dilemma she will face in the field. How can Edith keep the students in mind while juggling the beliefs about history she gained from the course? And perhaps experience in the classroom will allow her to bring those pieces together.

Discussion of Course

The four themes suggest that the History 328 did indeed have an impact on the students. Thinking about history evolved over the course of the semester. This view is reinforced when looking at student talk in relation to goals laid out by Professor Thomas. Each teacher discussed many ideas she gathered from the course. All three of the teachers talked considerably about each of the following:

- Causation in history
- Historians' views affecting their telling of events
- The importance of critically reading all text, but in particular historical text

Two of the three, Edith and Terri, included the following in their talk:

- Literary style
- Historical methodology

All five of these topics can clearly be recognized as important course goals laid out by Thomas in his interview. The professor did get his point across. How did he accomplish this?

***Clio* and Course Goals**

Thomas had a clear sense of goals and taught directly to these goals. Key themes in the course were repeated across classes and in different ways. The *Clio* text is a good starting point for demonstrating this. The importance of paying attention to author and

literary style is mentioned in every introduction. For instance, in the section on Francis Parkman, the reader is told of both Parkman's aristocratic background and his strong interest in the wilderness. From the introduction, students find out that Parkman liked to visit places where historical events he wrote about took place. He wanted his writing to evoke the sense that nature in its primitive form had an impact on the human world. Here several themes, literary style, author background and causation, are neatly tied together. Later in the introduction, the reader is introduced to one of the sources employed by Parkman in writing his account and encouraged to compare Parkman's telling to the primary document. This discussion allows a consideration of historical methodology. What of the final theme, critical reading of text? This idea is implicit throughout this and every introduction. One can only get at an understanding of how author background intertwines with literary style and causation through a critical reading of text. Then, critical reading is reinforced through classroom discussion as are the other themes.

Class Structure

The daily organization of HI 328 primarily involved discussion, with an occasional lecture and videotape. During discussion, interactional flow was driven by questions put forth by Thomas. After an initial question was answered, probing follow-up questions frequently moved discussion into deeper terrain. For instance, early in the semester Herodotus was discussed. Thomas reviewed some information about Herodotus' background and then asked, "What is new about his history?" Several students spoke, pointing out that Herodotus traveled. They then went on to discuss how travel affected his work as a historian. A discussion of style was introduced by asking the students if they liked the reading. This moved the conversation into a consideration of how the historian showed the personalities of characters portrayed which in turn led to comments concerning the author's views on historical causation. Students argued back and forth about the question of free will versus fate. Terri chimed

in at one point arguing for the importance of destiny in Herodotus' writing, citing a specific passage in the text. After approximately ten minutes of conversation about fate, Thomas moved the discussion back to a consideration of free will. He asked the students where they saw that idea posited in Herodotus' writing. Again, with reference to text, Edith and others mentioned the actions of characters laid out by Herodotus. The discussion ended (Classnotes, 9/26). This class was typical of classroom dynamic. Thomas' frequent requirement to draw support from the text reinforced his goal of deep reading. This question/discussion pattern and the focus on historian and historical view was reflected in every class conversation growing from the Clio text.

Generally, Thomas waited until the students volunteered to participate but also called on students who tended to be quiet. Students who were chronically quiet were gently prodded through informal comments on tests or through one-to-one conversation. Remembering that class size was 10, there was a built in pressure to be ready for class by reading carefully. Thomas reinforced his expectation that students read carefully through his use of frequent unannounced quizzes.

Literary Style and Historical Methodology

Some classes involved a more intense concern with literary style and methodology. The discussion on the Parkman reading serves as a good example. The heart of this discussion revolved around a comparison of Parkman's description of LaSalle's voyages with a description from one of his primary sources. Thomas asked, "What is different in the two accounts?" Students cited specific instances from each text. Again, they were modeling a close reading. Eventually, Thomas moved the students to a consideration of Parkman's style. He asked: "What caught your eye about the telling (Parkman's)?" Students made reference to the vividness of description, both in terms of character and setting. The students then discussed how Parkman's style made readers feel like they were there. For instance, one student cited Parkman's assertion that the explorers were "'pelted' by sleet and rain." Her focus was on the use of "pelted" to

illustrate how Parkman used words to capture the feel of the moment. Thomas then brought the conversation around to Parkman and his views on nature. Thomas pointed out that Parkman began the section with this phrase: "The parting was not auspicious." He encouraged the students to see that Parkman's point is "trouble comes from nature." Thomas emphasized that the natural environment was important to Parkman. Pushing this point harder, he referred to Parkman's use of personification in phrases such as "bear limbs" and the smoke "crept." Thomas pointed out that Parkman "wants you to think of nature as a character." Through a critical and deep reading of the text, students in Thomas' class experience the relationship between the historian's literary style and their view of history, including the particular event they are describing.(Classnotes 10/24).

Using literary style as a major focus throughout much of the course, Thomas slowly shifted to a more intense consideration of historical methodology. Methodology is never missing as reflected in the conversation about Parkman. Students did examine the source from which Parkman constructed his account, but they were encouraged to focus on how Parkman shaped his telling. Toward the end, methodology came to the forefront of conversation. Borrowing from Collingwood, Thomas encouraged students to view historical methodology as detective work. In one unobserved class referred to in interviews by the students, Thomas had the students focus on the classroom itself. The room is located on the third floor of an old four-story building consisting of classrooms and offices. In earlier days, top floors had been used for dormitories. In this particular lesson, students were to to reconstruct the original use of the space by looking for clues in the classroom (Tamara Interview III, 12/13). In another (observed) class that focused on methodology, students were handed the text of a letter and asked to identify the author. Thomas began,: "Tell me from this letter what kind of person this is." (They knew from the heading it was written in 1904.) Referring to specific pieces of the letter, students responded to Thomas' question. He asked, "How do you know it is a man?" Students referred to a tuxedo and the author's self-description as a

"prominent democratic fellow." Thomas went on to ask, "How do you know he had money?" Students cited the author's reference to attending Harvard, the fact he traveled back and forth a lot, and the fact that he ate at fine restaurants. As the conversation continued, one student pulled enough clues from the letter and from her own background knowledge to claim that the E in the letter was Eleanor and that the author of the letter was Franklin Roosevelt. The student was correct. This conversation took place during the last week of class. Students did not move to this focused look at historical methodology until they had studied the literary styles and views of many classic historians (Classnotes, 12/4).

Assessment

The main devices used for assessment were unannounced quizzes, tests, and papers. Quizzes tended to ask for a quick recall of a theme from the writing, generally a consideration of the author's views on causation. Tests asked for an elaboration of these themes. The titles from three of Edith's papers convey a sense of the essay assignments. They were: "Stepping into history: How and why the literary devices of McCauley and Michelet place the reader in the past;" "Causation lies beneath: A discussion of the similarities and differences of the causal ideas of Bede and Froissart;" and "The processes of history: Connections between chapters 1 and 4." (The last essay concerned a discussion of Carr's *What is History?)*

Overall Course Impact

Overall, what seems to be happening in the course? Clearly, the three students in this study resonated to the course themes. What might have allowed that to happen? Perhaps the most powerful factor is the clarity of goals and the directness to which the goals were taught. There is a less-is-more quality to the overall course. For instance, literary style is a core idea behind all aspects of the curriculum. In many ways, literary style was the magician's hat from which other ideas were pulled. Literary style led to a consideration of historian's positionality, causation, and the importance in deep reading

for unlocking historical text.

Course themes were replicated and reinforced in other ways. Consider first the *Clio* text. Recall that each introduction to *Clio* touched on course themes. These themes were then considered in class. The 21 readings served as multiple opportunities for examining the ideas in the course. Another factor that reinforced themes was classroom process itself. The notion of deep reading was employed in every discussion of *Clio* entries. Conversation stayed close to text. Recall also that historical methodology was intertwined with classroom process. Thomas' questions about the Roosevelt letter drove the detective like inquiry. The questioning process helped students to see how doing history is like being a detective.

The allusion to repetition in the course might suggest tedium. Nothing in the student talk suggested this reaction. The opposite was true. Students were indeed energized to think both in the class setting and beyond. In support, here are two comments from Tamara:

> I kind of go back and try to model how he's thinking. I just go back and say okay what would Dr. Thomas say about that kind of thing or when he gives examples of where he is pointing that kind of stuff out, I always try to go back and really look hard for those kind of things that he points out. I use him as a model to find my own things in the story.

> It really helps me to think in a broader sense when I am doing other things. Even watching the news, it helps me really think differently about things in the world and not taking things for face value, but actually reading into it. When I do other work for other classes, I guess in Political Science too, we have to read the *Washington Post*, and all the stories make you wonder why the author makes certain statements and what were they thinking when they wrote it. What kinds of facts did they have to back up what they were saying? (II, 10/10)

The final observation about the course, suggested by Tamara's comments, concerns the impact of modeling. Thomas modeled a style of critical reading and a way of thinking. Students had opportunities to experience this throughout the semester. They practiced the critical reading and thinking about text both in class with Thomas and through written assignments. As Tamara's comments suggest, it was very natural

to take that manner of thinking and reading and to place it into other contexts. One has to wonder how these skills and well-learned themes will play out in the teachers' practice.

Conclusion

A course in the methodology and philosophy of history courses is a potential site for helping new teachers develop the sort of thinking that will be needed as part of the effort to improve the teaching of history. How should such courses be shaped to promote the education of history teachers in a manner that is consistent with this reform effort? How can teacher educators build on the work done in such courses to support teaching that acknowledges the richness and complexity of history as a discipline? Answers to these questions are suggested by the experiences of Tamara, Terri, and Edith as students in HI 328.

Teaching History: Psychologizing the Curriculum

The course helped the three teachers move beyond their conceptions of the secondary history classroom, which were shaped by previous experience. Recall that Tamara, Terri, and Edith started the course with certain memories about learning history. Most salient were the projects and fieldtrips. For Tamara, the doing represented by these memories stood alongside the tedium of learning the facts. The doing of active approaches such as projects and the focus on factual learning reflect elements that can be seen in the historian's work. Nonetheless, when viewed in contrast to what happens in Thomas' History 328, these traditional classroom approaches only caricature the historical enterprise and clearly miss its essence. Thomas moves the students back from the historical presentations and mere activities of historians to the historian's themselves. They critically tear apart the product, generally writing, and reveal the doing as much greater than fun activity and end product as much more alive than inert facts. The result is a change in thinking about history and also in history

teaching. Considering the depth of change in the three, it seems fair to say that the course illustrates what John Dewey calls psychologizing the curriculum. To be psychologized, the subject "must be restored to the experiences from which it has been abstracted" (Dewey, 1959). The historian's "experience" is the heart of the course.

The three teachers took the historian's experience as presented in History 328 and made it their own. Though Thomas delivers a clear message to his students, all three teachers in this study reconfigured that message within the context of their own perspective. All came into the course with their own ideas and their own quandaries about history. The special nature of their thoughts and questions allowed them to learn in a personal way. In particular, the students came to the course with confusions about the epistemological nature of history that drove their inquiry within the course. This suggests how psychologizing the curriculum weds the problems of the student to the problems of the scholar. The course was able to touch those uncertainties within the three concerning the way historians know and the claims that historians make. How did Thomas accomplish this? Students in his class engaged with texts left by historians over a great span of time. Thomas gently kept his students deeply engaged with the text, encouraging the examination of every word, every phrase, every punctuation mark. Through such scrutiny, genuine quandaries that Tamara, Terri, and Edith brought to the course were confronted and, to a large extent, were resolved. Students came to see the activity and products as something alive and purposeful, much more than mere activity. By working through the problems students brought to the course through this "deep reading" of text, the curriculum was psychologized. That is, they found the work of the historian within their own thinking and concerns.

By getting inside and psychologizing historical writing, the three teachers were able to reconstruct their view of teaching. Recall the conversation about Parkman's descriptive style, the detective work used on Roosevelt's letter, and the close scrutiny of all text. By examining how historian's go about doing their tasks, students can consider new forms of activity in the classroom. Activity transforms from being just projects or

fieldtrips to elements of historical inquiry practiced by historians. Such transformation can be seen in Tamara's talk about comparing and contrasting primary documents, in Terri's use of Robin Hood's tombstone to make history real, and Edith's call to have students ask why a historian wrote what they did.

Implications for Teacher Education

And what does this mean for those engaged in the enterprise of teacher education, especially in the area of social studies? First of all, the study reinforces the need for tight links between education departments and departments engaged in conveying the discipline expressed by McDiramid and Vinten-Johansen (2000). Those in the education department need to become aware of the views about history that students are taking from their history courses. Such a process begins through conversation between the respective departments leading to reciprocal impact. The teacher educator comes to know the beliefs posited by the historians. The historians come to see the interrelationship between their views of history and their methods of teaching. One clear example of view/method interrelationship is Thomas' "deep reading" method. For Thomas, the historian imbeds her vision within her style of writing and the student of history unlocks the vision through how they engage in text. For Thomas, there is no separation between what he does as a classroom teacher and his philosophy of history. Self-consciousness prompted by interdepartmental dialogue might permit historians to hone and reflectively develop their methods. Such carefully constructed methods might then be adapted for use in the secondary classroom by students from the class.

Reciprocal impact must be felt by the teacher educator. Through an awareness of experiences such as HI 328, those who prepare teachers can draw on the teaching methods that mirror the scholar's doing and help future teachers identify, adapt, and employ these approaches. Methods courses delivered by education departments would need to be redesigned with consideration of what happens in the other departments. One important role for teacher educators would be to bring the child part of the

child/curriculum problem proposed by Dewey back into the equation. Perhaps eighth-grade students might not be able to read as deeply as Tamara, Terri, and Edith, but one wonders if they could look carefully at two tellings of the same event, identify their differences, and recognize that viewpoint is expressed in the way the story is told.

Teacher educators would need to help new teachers bring the heart of the historian's work into the field. This suggests a distinct job for the the supervisor of student teaching and returns to the issue of the relationship between the department that teaches the discipline and the education department. The education department needs to know the minds of the people teaching the discipline as well as the approaches they employ. The supervisor must understand how those ideas have developed in the thinking of each teacher. It is also important for the student to have an awareness of their thinking. For many, it will be tacit. Tamara, Terri, and Edith had the additional experience of an interviewer who asked them to articulate their views on history as well as their views on history teaching. This suggests a role the field supervisor might play. More importantly, the supervisor would need to help the student teacher see the relationship between views of the discipline and views of pedagogy. Beyond that, the supervisor must help the students navigate their way through all of the contextual issues such as student apathy, cooperating teacher style, and curricular demands due to testing, which might create problems in implementing these new approaches.

Suggestions for Research

The issue of taking the new vision into the field suggests a need for further research. What happens to the student who grows in the way Tamara, Terri, and Edith did when they work with young people? Are the contextual demands of the public school classroom so overpowering that they are unable to actualize their new view of teaching history? Can the historian's work be psychologized for the typical ninth-grade student? These questions will be examined as Tamara steps into her student teaching high school placement. With an awareness of how she thinks, this extended study will

explore the relationship between what she has come to believe about teaching history and her developing practice.

Final Thoughts

Thomas' course reveals that richness and complexity within the historian's work discussed earlier. Experiencing that view of history through the eyes of Tamara, Terri, and Edith, that is through the eyes of teachers, one senses how connections between pedagogy and discipline can naturally be made. The either-ors about which Dewey (1959) warns us can be and must be avoided. As he reminds us, the curriculum does not have to reside outside the student:

> From the side of the child, it is a question of seeing how his experience already contains within itself-facts and truths-of just the same sort as those entering into the formulated study; and, what is of more importance, of how it contains within itself the attitudes, the motives, and the interests which have operated in developing and organizing the subject-matter which it now occupies...Abandon the notion of subject-matter as something fixed and ready-made in itself, outside the child's experience; cease thinking of the child's experience; cease thinking of the child's experience as also something hard and fast; see it as something fluent, embryonic, vital; and we realize that the child and the curriculum are simply two limits which define a single process (96-97).

In this instance, the future teachers are the children. These teachers who have experienced the "subject matter" in its scholarly essence are now in a position to provide the same experiences for their students. This enriched view of history allows for a new approach to teaching history. As Tamara, Terri, and Edith step into the field, they consider the student, thereby adding a new dimension to their thinking and their problem. As they teach their students, the complexity of engaging young people in the process of historical thinking increases. Banishing the either/or involves a continuous weaving back and forth. When the issues reflected in the movement to reform history teaching are viewed in the context of one student learning history, the immensity of the task is magnified. The reform task might be more manageable if it involved the partnering of education and history departments who in many ways are responsible for severing child from curriculum and are in a position to bring the two together.

REFERENCES

Bain, R. B. (2000). Into the breach: Using research and theory to shape history instruction. In P. N. Stearns, P. Seixas, and S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing teaching & learning history* (pp. 331-352). New York: New York University Press.

Bartlett, I., Fenton, E., Fowler, D., & Mandelbaum, S. (1969). *A new history of the United States: An inquiry approach.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Barton, K. C. (1997). "I just kinda know": Elementary students' ideas about historical evidence. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 25 (4), 407-430.

Booth, M. (1994). Cognition in history: A British perspective. *Educational Psychologist*, 29(2). 61-69.

Carretero, M. & Voss, J. F. (1994). *Cognitive and instructional processes in history and the social sciences.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Dewey, J. The child and the curriculum. In *Dewey on Education* (pp. 91-111). NY: Teachers College Press

Gagnon, P. & The Bradley Commission on History in Schools (Eds.), (1989). *Historical literacy: The case for history in American education.* New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory.* Chicago: Aldine.

Leinhardt, G., Beck, I. & L., Stainton (Eds.). (1994). *Teaching and learning in history.* Hillsdale, NJ. :Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Levstik, L. S. & Barton, K. C. (1997). *Doing history: Investigating with children in elementary and middle schools.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Lincoln, Y. S. , & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

McDiarmid, G. W. (1994). Understanding history for teaching: A study of the historical understanding of prospective teachers. In M. Carretero & J. F. Voss (Eds.), *Cognitive and instructional processes in history and social sciences* (pp. 159-185). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

McDiarmid, G. W. & Vinten-Johanen, P. (2000). A catwalk across the great divide: Redesigning the history teaching methods course. In P. N. Stearns, P. Seixas, and S. Wineburg (Eds.), *Knowing teaching & learning history* (pp. 156-177). New York: New York University Press.

National History Standards Project. (1994). *National standards for history: Basic edition.* Los Angeles: National Center for History in the Schools.

Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Wineburg, S. S. (1991). Historical problem solving: A study of the cognitive processes used in the evaluation of documentary and pictorial evidence. *Journal of Educational Psychology,* 83, 73-87.

Wineburg, S. S. (1994). The cognitive representation of historical texts. In Leinhardt, G., Beck, I. & L., Stainton (Eds.). Teaching *and learning in history* (pp. 85-135.). Hillsdale, NJ. :Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Wineburg, S. S. (1998). Reading Abraham Lincoln: An expert/expert study in the interpretation of historical texts. *Cognitive Science.* 22(3), 319-346.

Wineburg, S. S. (1999) Historical thinking and other unnatural acts. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 80, 488-499.

Wineburg, S. S. (2001). *Historical thinking and other unnatural acts: Charting the future of teaching the past.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Yeager, E. A. & Davis, O. L. (1995). Between campus and classroom: Secondary student-teachers' thinking about historical texts. *Journal of Research and Development in Education,* 29 (1), 1-8.

Yeager, E. A. & Doppen, F. H. (2001). Teaching and learning multiple perspectives on the use of the atomic bomb: Historical empathy in the secondary classroom. In O. L. Davis, E. A. Yeager, & S. J. Foster (Eds.), *Historical empathy and perspective taking in the social studies* (pp.97-114). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Yeager, E. A. & Wilson, E. K. (1997). Teaching historical thinking in the social studies methods course: A case study. *Social Studies,* 88 (3), 121-127.

APPENDIX A: TEACHER INTERVIEW I
(Before the course begins)

Theme: Learning about history

1. I'd like to start by having you give me a brief history of your formal education. Approximately, how many history course did you take/have you taken as an undergraduate?

2. I'd like to continue our conversation by exploring what someone might call your history autobiography. Do you remember what it was like to learn history in school, K-12 and college? Tell me about your experience learning history in a school setting. These could be what you view as good, bad, or neutral memories.

- *As people talk about their experiences, probe. In those experiences which you remember best, describe how history was taught?*

- *And probe to find out what they learned about history from these experiences.*

3. It seems that people learn about history in many different settings and situations. Outside of school, what are some ways you have learned about history? Describe the experience.

- *If no ideas, suggest TV, visits to historical sites, family. Again, the probe is to get people to describe them and maybe talk about their view of history as a result.*

Theme: How history is viewed

4. Which previous experiences studying history influenced your views and feelings about history the most? What did you learn from these experiences? *(This question will take the most time. Some answers may have come up naturally in the discussions in 1 and 2. Students will be encouraged to describe the experiences in detail and to elaborate on their learning.)*

5. Now I'm going to give you a scenario to react to. Imagine that you are in a school that wants to drop the teaching of history. How would you answer this question for your colleagues: Why do you think young people should study history?

Theme: Thinking historically

6. Now I'd like to hear your thoughts about history as a discipline: I want to start by getting you to think concretely about historical events and to think about these events in a personal manner. What are two or three events from history which you feel hold a great deal of significance?

- *Go back over each one and ask: In your view, what makes this significant?)*

7. Imagine that you are teaching in a high school and that you choose the following as a goal: Students will demonstrate an ability to think historically. What does it mean to think historically? What sort of thinking will students who reach this goal be demonstrating?

Theme: Teaching history

8. I want you to imagine one more time. Imagine your future classroom. How will you go about teaching history?

APPENDIX B: TEACHER INTERVIEW II AND III

1. Describe a typical day in History 328.

2. Let's say you were talking to another student who was going to be taking History 328 and wanted to know what the course was like. Considering all that has happened in class and all you have done outside in preparation for the class, what are the most significant experiences you have had as a student in History 328?

- *Probe to get them to talk about the experiences.*
- *Why are these experiences significant to you?*

3. Talking to that same student, what experiences have been least significant for you?

- *Probe to get them to talk about the experiences.*
- *Why do you think these experiences are not so significant to you?*

4. After *the student has talked, bring up specific occurrences from the course that you want to examine (class events, books, papers).* i.e. Tell me about writing such and such paper or reading such and such book. *(Probe to get out an assessment of the learning.)*

5.I want to return to a couple of questions I asked you in our first interview. Imagine that you are in a school that wants to drop the teaching of history. How would you answer this question for your colleagues: Why do you think young people should study history?

6. Imagine that you are teaching in a high school and that you choose the following as a goal: Students will demonstrate an ability to think historically. What does it mean to think historically? What sort of thinking will students who reach this goal be demonstrating?

7. How has your experience in history 328 influenced your answer to the above two questions?

8.I want you to imagine one more time. Imagine your future classroom. How will you go about teaching history?

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW OF COURSE INSTRUCTOR

Theme: Course History

1. Could you tell me about the origins of the course?

- *How long has it been taught?*
- *Who first taught it?*
- *What was the original conception and design of the course?*

2. How has the course evolved over the years?

- *Has it changed in terms of goals? course design?*
- *Who has taught the course? Did the course change with instructors?*

Theme: Goals

3. What is the purpose of HI 328? Overall, what are you trying to accomplish with your students?

- *Probe to get at: How would you hope your students view history as a result of taking this course?*

4. One things that is clear from my one observation, skimming your text and syllabus there is a focus on the philosophy of history? Why? What do you hope to accomplish?

- *Also, probe to see how the course fits into the liberal arts.*

5. You mentioned in the class reading the book of II Samuel from the Bible. Why do you do that? Why do you read *What is history?*

- *Issue: Conscious choice to use the primary documents, actual words of the historiographers. Why????*

6.I want to ask you about some of the more unorthodox aspects of the course. Why do you include the following in History 328?

- Rashomon
- Leuchtenberg account of 1940 election
- Josephine Tey, *The Daughter of Time*
- *Richard the Third*

7. What are you trying to get your students to do through the papers? [What sorts of tasks do you give them for these papers? Why do you give them these tasks?]

8. Was the class I observed typical of History 328? If so, what were your goals in that class? If not, what do you normally do? What is your purpose? (What would a typical day in History 328 look like? Why is it structured that way?)

9.*I will have examined the syllabus for the course. I will talk Thomas through the syllabus in hopes of unpacking the key themes and goals of the course.*

a. What are the most significant activities in the course? Why are they significant?
b. What are the most significant topics in the course? Why are they significant?
c. Choose salient topics and assignments which were not mentioned. Ask for description first and then an explanation for why they are included in the course.

Theme: Thinking Historically,

10. If the question does not come up naturally in #3, ask: What does it mean to <u>think historically?</u>

Theme: Assessed Impact of Course

11. Here *are some other issues that I want to bring up if they don't come up naturally through the discussion in question 2.*

a. How will your students be different as a result of taking History 328
b. How will your students think differently as a result of taking History 328?
c. What does it mean to think historically?

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Learning to Think Historically: The Impact of a Philosophy and Methods of History Course on Three Preservice Teachers	
Author(s): Robert H. Mayer	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Robert H. Mayer	Printed Name/Position/Title: Robert H. Mayer, Professor of Education
Organization/Address: Moravian College, 1200 Main St, Bethlehem, PA 18018	Telephone: (610) 861-1452 FAX: (610) 861-1696
	E-Mail Address: rhmm02@moravian.edu Date: 04/23/2003

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC/CHESS
2805 E. Tenth Street, #120
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)